

### REMARKS

This restriction requirement is traversed on the basis of MPEP Section 803 that requires that the Examiner examine the application on the merits if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. In the present case, all of the groups are classified in class 250. Since the Examiner will search online, these subclasses can be combined for one search, and the search and examination can be conducted without undue burden.

If the restriction requirement is maintained, it will be clear on the record that the PTO considers the twenty eight groups to be patentably distinct from one another i.e., *prima facie* non-obvious from one another. This means that a reference identical to the one group would not render the other group *prima facie* obvious.

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By



Anne M. Kornbau  
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:msp  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\C\cohn\Frumker1\Pto\Frumker1.restrict.doc